

SESSION #11
2018-02-12
FM2-126

Notes: Nisa and I reviewed constructions I created that Nisa checked with a woman from her community. Nisa and I reviewed her judgments on these constructions, and Nisa also gave her own judgments. Nisa's recording session with her occurred on December 23, 2017. These constructions are investigating the question of whether P, R, and T are equally accessible to syntactic operations (especially across AV and PV).

FM2-126 starts here

(9a) Kanak bèng dagang kèpèng (9b)___Dagang kanak bèng kèpèng
'A child gives a seller money'

-Here we have AV constructions. (9a) is okay, (9b) is not (Nisa's speaker "hated it"). Can't put the R before the A in AV.

(9c) Kanak no bèng dagang no kèpèng (9d)___Dagang no kanak no bèng kèpèng
'The child gives the seller money' ?'The child gives the seller money'

-OK, (9c) is "beautiful" because it has R with DEM. (10a) shows the same construction with no DEM specifying A.

-(9d) is improved from (9b), but the RAVT word order where R is fronted before A is still dispreferred. Instead, it makes Nisa want to create a relative clause via *saq* would make it better, as in (9e)

(9e) Né dagang saq kanak no bèng kèpèng
'This is the seller that the child gave the money'
-This is also a good example of R being extracted from an AV clause

(10a) Kanak bèng dagang no kèpèng (10b)___Dagang no bèng=ne kèpèng
'A child gave the seller money' 'It's the seller that he gave the money'

-(10a) is OK "without any context". (10b), however, is a borderline AV/PV case and is OK only if *no* is present with *dagang*. So you can front R in borderline AV/PV if R is specified, but it creates a cleft/topicalized reading.

(10c)___Dagang no bèng=ne kèpèng siq kanak no
'A child gave the seller money'

-Here the borderline case from (10b) is no longer borderline: It's clearly PV because we now have a *siq*-phrase. In fact, Nisa jokingly said (10c) is "beautiful ... I'm so touched".

(11a) Kanak bèng dagang kèpèng (11b) Kèpèng kanak bèng dagang
'child gives a seller money' *'child gives a seller money'

-Back to AV constructions. Sari says (11a) is totally OK, but Nisa prefers a DEM with the agent *kanak*.

-Fronting the T in AV is not allowed: (11b) is ill-formed, b/c 'money' is interpreted as the agent

(11c) Kèpèng no kanak bèng dagang

-(11c) is still not OK, again because 'money' is still the agent

(12a) Kanak bèng dagang kèpèng
'A child gave a seller money'

(12b) Kèpèng bèng=ne dagang

-(12a) is still OK, because it's the same as (11a). (12b) is another borderline case, and the T is fronted. Nisa says it's OK but feels incomplete.

(12c) Kèpèng no bèng=ne dagang
'S/he gave a seller money'

-Nisa says this one is better than (12b), likely because the fronted T is specified.

(12d) Kèpèng bèng=ne dagang siq kanak no
'A child gave a seller money'

-Here we have Nisa says this is "better" than (12b): "It's more the topic is on *kèpèng*". So here we have a fronted T in a clear PV construction, due to *siq*-phrase. Nisa says it's OK.

(26a) Ie kapong dengan [saq beli buku no]
'She hugged the guy who bought the book'

(26b) *Ie kapong dengan [saq=ne beli buku no]

-(26a) is better than (26b), where A is extracted from AV. (26b) is no good because of =ne

(26b) *Ie kapong dengan [saq=ne beli buku no] (27a) *Ie kapong dengan [saq beli=ne buku no]

-(27a) only works if the clitic =ne from (26b) is removed (Nisa's speaker confirmed this). Gap strategy violation.

(27b) Buku [saq beli=ne no]

(27c) Buku [saq=ne beli no]

-'The book that he bought' ... but the sentence isn't finished because it's a relative clause sitting on its own, so see (27d, e)

(27d) Aku gitaq buku [saq beli=ne no]
'I saw the book that he bought'

(27e) Aku gitaq buku [saq=ne beli no]
'I saw the book that he bought'

-"There is a subtle difference" between (27d) and (27e). (27d) has more of a focus on the book, and (27e) has more of a focus on the person who bought the book. This difference is conditioned by the word order: In (27e), the agent clitic comes before the verb so it's more the focus So P is extracting from a borderline clause with a clitic Agent

(28) *Ie kapong dengan_i saq=ne_i beli buku no siq dengan no_i

-(28) is not good. The clitic is bad, and "it's awful" because of the *siq*-phrase. Again, violation of the gap strategy, when you extract A from a PV clause.

(28b) Ie kapong buku [saq dengan no beli]
'she/he hugged the book [that the man bought]'

(29) [Ie_i kapong buku [saq=ne_i beli]

-(28b) shows a P extracting from AV into AV

-(29)'s translation is 'He hugged the book that he bought'. In (29) the book "belongs to ie".

(26a) Ie kapong buku saq dengan no beli

(30) Ie kapong buku saq siq=ne beli

-(30) is even better than (29) because of the *saq siq*

(31a) le kapong buku saq siq=ne beli siq dengan no
 -(31a) is even better than (30) because it gives more information

(31b) Aku beli paoq no (31c) Kamu kaken paoq saq aku beli (no)
 'I bought the mango' 'You ate the mango that I bought'

-Note: (31b-31i) were checked with Nisa outside of a recording session

-(31c) is better with RC-final no. (31c) is a good example of P extracting from an AV relative clause, with no problem.

(31d) siq=m kaken paoq [saq aku beli (no)] (31e) siq=n kaken paoq [saq aku beli]
 'You ate the mango that I bought' 'She/he ate the mango that I bought'

-(31d) is better with RC-final no, but (31d) "sounds like a Javanese person speaking Sasak" (i.e., an L2 speaker of Sasak), because of all the full NPs. The point for (31d, e), though, is that you can extract a P from AV into PV, but it sounds L2-ish

(31j) siq=m kaken paoq saq=ku beli (no) (31j) siq=n kaken paoq saq=ku beli (no)
 -it's better here with saq=ku than (31d) and (31c). Both are much better with *no* at the end of the RC. The point here is that you can extract P from PV into PV

(31f) siq=ku beli paoq no (31g) Kamu kaken paoq saq siq=ku beli (no)
 'I bought the mango' 'You ate the mango that I bought'

-both are good, but (31g) is even better with no. (31g) shows P extracted from PV into AV

(31h) siq=m kaken paoq saq siq=ku beli (no) (31i) siq=n kaken paoq saq siq=ku beli (no)
 'You ate the mango that I bought' 'She/he ate the mango that I bought'

-again, both are better with RC-final no. The point is that both show P extracting from PV into PV.

SECTION 3: Can R and T be extracted from both AV and PV?

- Try asking people which sentence in each pair they prefer better, or if they are both equally OK

(32a) Aku bèng dagang no kèpèng (32b) Siq=ku bèng dagang no kèpèng
 'I gave the seller money' 'I gave the seller money'

-Just trying to get a clear-cut distinction between AV and PV for the same translation. (32a) is "not the first choice" for natural speech, and (32b) "is more natural". Seems like these three-argument constructions with three full NPs are less natural and casual than reducing one or more arguments to a clitic.

(33a) Né dagang saq aku bèng kèpèng (33b) Né dagang saq bèng=ku kèpèng
 'This is the seller who I gave money' 'This is the seller who gave me money'

-According to Nisa and her speaker, the agent and recipient changes between (33a) and (33b). In (33a), *aku* is the agent. In (33b), *dagang* is the agent. So the borderline case in (33b) forces a change in interpreting the thematic role of the cliticized argument

(33b) Né dagang saq bèng=ku kèpèng

'This is the seller who gave me money'

(34a) Né dagang saq siq=ku bèng kèpèng

'This is the seller who I gave money'

-the meaning is changed between (33b) and (34a). In 33b the =ku is post-verbal, which makes sure =ku is not the agent.

-Nisa's speaker "likes the siq" version better in (34a) than in (34b). I suspect that's because the cliticized argument in 34b is still more ambiguous than the one in 34a: When you have siq + clitic, there's no ambiguity about who the agent is, but with saq=ku, it takes just a bit more effort to interpret it

(34b) Né dagang saq=ku bèng kèpèng

'This is the seller who I gave money'

-(34b) is a minimal pair with (33b), where the position of the clitic changes and thereby changes the interpretation. (34a) and (34b) mean the same thing, because as Nisa notes, the agent clitic is before the verb in both cases.

(35a) Né dagang saq ie bèng kèpèng

'This is the seller who he gave money'

(35b) Né dagang saq=ne bèng kèpèng

'This is the seller who he gave money'

-(35b) is better. (35a) sounds "more Javanese", like a Javanese speaker who picked up Sasak as an L2. Again, the pre-verbal argument in the relative clause is interpreted as the agent

(36) Né dagang saq siq=ne bèng kèpèng

-(35b) and (36) have the "same meaning" because in both cases the agent is pre-verbal. In 36a the "siq" makes it focused to one particular *dagang*.

(37a) Né kèpèng saq aku bèng dagang no

'This is the money that I gave the seller'

(37b) Né kèpèng saq bèng=ku dagang no

'This is the money that I gave the seller'

-(37b) is better. (37a) again sounds like a Javanese L1 speaking Sasak. The point, though, is that T can be extracted from AV (37a) and from a borderline case (37b).

(38a) Né kèpèng saq bèng=ku dagang

'This is the money that I gave the seller'

(38b) Né kèpèng saq siq=ku bèng dagang

-(38b) is better than borderline case (38a). They mean the same thing (probably because the post-verbal agent in (38a) cannot be interpreted as a Theme or Recipient due to animacy of 'money'), but the pre-verbal agent in 38b is preferred. Again, pre-verbal A is preferred.

(38c) Né kèpèng saq=ku bèng dagang

-(38a, b, c) mean the same thing. But pre-verbal agent in (38c) is better than (38a). (38b) is slightly more focused than (38c), according to Nisa's speaker, like (38b) is "conveying the agent more".

(39a) Né kèpèng saq ie bèng dagang

'This is the money he gave the seller'

(39b) Né kèpèng saq=ne bèng dagang

-again, (39a) sounds a Sasak L2 from Java, and (39b) is better. Yes, it's a borderline case, but the preference for using a clitic agent is strong. And its pre-verbal position overrides any potential ambiguity in interpretation

(40a) Né kèpèng saq=ne bèng dagang

(40b) Né kèpèng saq bèng=ne dagang

'This is the money that he gave the seller'

'this is the money that he gave the seller'

-40a is better, according to Nisa's speaker. But Nisa feels they are both OK, but Nisa says "I see why she prefers that". Nisa feels 40b should be followed by another clause or more information, that 40a "is more complete". "If you have to make just one sentence, we would choose 40a instead of 40b". Again, this is showing a preference for pre-verbal A

(40b) Né kèpèng saq bèng=ne dagang

(40c) Né kèpèng saq siq=ne bèng dagang

-(40b) and (40c) mean the same thing, but Nisa says "*siq* is better" in (40c). That's the "first spontaneously coming out of the native speaker of Sasak"